

From: Greg Metcalfe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/25/02 8:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm amazed that Microsoft's refusal to allow any other OS to be loaded on a hardware vendor's systems (making them dual-boot capable) was never mentioned in the first trial. Surely this is a leveraging a monopoly? Until this issue is addressed, few contenders from the Linux world will have an even remote shot at a notable desktop market share. I own no Red Hat Linux, et al, stock. And I usually run Linux at home. One of the few, though, and I wish it would spread. Few home users are even aware that fragile operating systems are a Microsoft peculiarity. They think 'that's just the way computers are.' Because the market is *so* MS dominated.

Isn't the DoJ supposed to be protecting us? Why the cave-in?

Greg Metcalfe